DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 673 CS 009 866

AUTHOR	Liebling, Cheryl Rappaport
TITLE	Insight into Literature: Learning To Interpret Inside View and Character Plans in Fiction. Technical Report No. 486.
INSTITUTION	Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for the Study of Reading.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Nov 89
CONTRACT	G0087-C1001-89
NOTE	35p.; For pilot study, see ED 304 679.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Analysis of Variance; Basal Reading; Childrens Literature; *Fiction; Grade 3; *Instructional Effectiveness; Literary Devices; Primary Education; Reader Text Relationship; Reading Research; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Aesthetic Reading; Blume (Judy); Instructional Analysis; Text Factors

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to explore the ways in which instructional method and text quality influence the young reader's interpretation of inside view and character plans in fiction. Thirty-six third graders from a northeastern, suburban, public elementary school served as subjects. Twelve children were selected randomly from students rated as strong, average, and weak. Treatment conditions were randomly assigned to the groups: no instruction/original text (control); no instruction/basal text (control); "Insight into Literature"/original text; "Insight into Literature"/basal text; traditional instruction/original text; and traditional instruction/basal text. The original version of "Freckle Juice" and an adaptation of the story appearing in a basal reading series served as the text for the experimental investigation. Results of the quantitative analysis suggest that both instructional method and text quality influence the young reader's interpretation of inside view and character plans in fiction. The combination of original, unadapted texts and sociocognitive instructional methods that emphasize literary content shows promise as an alternative instructional context for reading during the elementary school years. The research suggests that young readers are capable of weaving an interpretation of literary form and content and a spontaneous storyretelling. Whether students will be successful in extending their recreations of stories through interpretation may depend upon their participation in instructional contexts that emphasize literary features. (Fifty-four references are attached.) (MG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313673

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING

Technical Report No. 486

INSIGHT INTO LITERATURE: LEARNING TO INTERPRET INSIDE VIEW AND CHARACTER PLANS IN FICTION

Cheryl Rappaport Liebling
BBN Systems and Technologies Corporation
Cambridge, Massachusetts

November 1989

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS009866

The work upon which this publication was based was supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement under Cooperative Agreement No. G0087-C1001-89 with the Reading Research and Education Center. The publication does not necessarily reflect the views of the agency supporting the research.

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD
1989-90

James Armstrong
Linda Asmussen
Gerald Arnold
Yahaya Bello
Diane Bottomley
Catherine Burnham
Candace Clark
Michelle Commeyras
John M. Consalvi
Christopher Currie
Irene-Anna Diakidoy
Barbara Hancin
Michael J. Jacobson
Jihn-Chang Jehng
Robert T. Jimenez
Bonnie M. Kerr
Paul W. Kerr
Juan Moran
Keisuke Ohtsuka
Kathy Meyer Reimer
Hua Shu
Anne Stallman
Marty Waggoner
Janelle Weinzierl
Pamela Winsor
Marsha Wise

MANAGING EDITOR
Fran Lehr

MANUSCRIPT PRODUCTION ASSISTANTS
Delores Plowman
Debra Gough

Abstract

This report presents the findings of an experiment that explored the ways in which instructional method and text quality influence the young reader's interpretation of inside view and character plans in a well-known children's story and one of its basal reader adaptations. The research created a core instructional context, *Insight Into Literature*, which unites a sociocognitive view of the reading process and a focus on literary form and content, and contrasted this context with alternatives in a 3 x 2 (Instructional Method: *Insight Into Literature* vs. Traditional vs. No Instruction x Text Type: Original vs. Basal Adaptation) posttest-only design.

A qualitative analysis of the discussions describes the important differences in the instructional contexts with respect to prereading, scaffolding by the experienced reader, and the social, cognitive, and literary focus components. In the storyretelling following participation in one of the six instructional contexts, the students were asked to try to weave their interpretation of inside view and character plans and their recall of the plot's main events. Their ability to do this was evaluated qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Separate 3 x 2 ANOVAS were conducted for each of three dependent measures: the plot actions of the Cooperative Interaction Plan, inside view, and character plans. The analyses revealed that both instructional method and text quality influence significantly the young reader's interpretation of inside view and character plans in fiction. Furthermore, the combination of original, unadapted texts and sociocognitive instructional methods that emphasize literary content shows promise as an alternative instructional context for reading during the elementary school years. Implications of the study for research and teaching are noted and the next phase of the project is discussed.

INSIGHT INTO LITERATURE: LEARNING TO INTERPRET INSIDE VIEW AND CHARACTER PLANS IN FICTION

Readers draw upon many different life experiences in re-creating stories, among which are prior encounters with the form and content of literature. Most often, re-creation is restricted to the nonverbal evocation of the story, arising from the reader's transaction with the text (Rosenblatt, 1982). On occasion, readers share their personal responses to the evoked story in conversations with friends. Rarely, however, do readers venture beyond personal response to engage in what Nelms (1988) describes as the third and fourth recursive stages of the reading process: interpretation and criticism.

> Eliciting personal response, though significant and necessary, is not sufficient if we are to help students become better interpreters. (Hansbury, 1988, p. 108)

Interpretation extends the reader's personal, aesthetic responses into a broader public arena in which groups of diverse readers, with respect to prior knowledge of the world and of literature, share their re-creations of stories. Through the public sharing, readers gain experience in interpretation that, in turn, promotes an appreciation of literature. Interpretation thus enables "analytic thinking and critical judgment without denying the pleasure of evocation or the importance of personal response" (Nelms, 1988, p. 8).

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of an experiment that explored the ways in which instructional method and text quality influence the young reader's interpretation of inside view and character plans in fiction. The research created a core instructional context for reading during the elementary school years, *Insight Into Literature*, which unites a sociocognitive view of the reading process and a focus on literary form and content.

The current research continues a line of inquiry that began with a survey of children's stories. The survey concluded that such literary features as inside view were less prominent in stories appearing in basal readers than in trade books (Bruce, 1984). This finding was supported by an interacting plans analysis of an original text, Judy Blume's *Freckle Juice* (1971) and a line-by-line contrast of the original text and one of its basal reader adaptations (Liebling, 1989a). The analysis revealed that in the course of adaptation, significant segments of the original text were deleted. These segments contain information that helps the reader create believable characters and interpret character interactions with respect to each character's underlying goals and beliefs.

In a pilot study with 12 students in Grade 3, the interacting plans text analysis was used as a map to help the experienced reader guide the students as they interpreted inside view and character plans in both versions of the story (Liebling, 1989b). The students participated in reading conferences focused upon these aspects of character. Their interpretations of inside view and character plans in the original and adapted versions of the story were contrasted prior to and following participation in the conferences. Tentative conclusions drawn from the pilot data suggest that despite the similarity of an instructional method that emphasized the literary form and content of each version of the story, important differences in interpretation persisted across experimental groups. These differences were related directly to the particular version of the story that had been read. This implies that interpretation is bound intimately to text quality, making it impossible for a student's prior knowledge of life and literature to compensate adequately for weaknesses in an adapted story.

The pilot study resulted in the development of a core instructional context for the interpretation of fiction that highlights the interplay of text quality and instructional method. The context supports the reading of original, unadapted high-quality literature and instructional methods that emphasize a sociocognitive view of reading coupled with a focus on literary form and content. In addition, the pilot study created a methodology for contrasting instructional contexts and student interpretations of inside view and character plans.

The present study utilized a 3 x 2 (Instructional Method x Text Type) posttest-only design and a larger sample of 36 students in Grade 3 to examine further the young reader's interpretation of inside view and character plans in a well-known children's story and one of its basal reader adaptations.

Instructional Contexts for Reading

Recently, criticisms of the quality of text selections and instructional methods in developmental reading programs have been voiced by many educators representing the spectrum of educational philosophy. Chief among the criticisms are those expressed by proponents of whole language instruction, reading and writing process, and the reading of tradebooks rather than basal textbooks as the central component of the reading instructional program (Atwell, 1984; Goodman, 1986; Hancock & Hill, 1987; Hansen, 1987; Hepler & Hickman, 1982; Hornsby, Sukarna & Parry, 1986; Watson & Davis, 1988). For example, the National Council of Teachers of English's Commission on Reading issued a report urging substantial changes in the ways in which reading is taught during the elementary school years (Goodman, Freeman, Murphy, & Shannon, 1987). The commission argued that whole language innovations in reading instruction be explored as alternatives to the traditional basal's controlled emphasis on skills. They commented that teachers need to be able to take part in decisions on the selections of texts and instructional materials used in classroom reading. Above all else, the reading of original, unadapted enduring classics and contemporary multicultural literature written by well-known authors should be central to the classroom reading program.

Whole language proponents, however, are not the only critics of developmental reading programs. The quality of text is of general concern to those who are dismayed that the "ruffles and flourishes" that characterize the language of engaging literature are often deleted from basal reader adaptations of fiction (Ohanian, 1987). Ravitch (1987) bemoans the "striking neglect of classic literature" in current basals, while Cheney (1987) argues that the current emphasis of basal readers on strategies rather than the enduring literary quality of the selections is misguided. She writes, "In the basal readers most widely used now, 10% or less of the content is classic children's literature" and that selections of contemporary fiction are "generally by writers whose names are unknown outside the textbook industry" (p. 14). She recommends that reading programs be developed that include more original works and fewer stories written according to readability formulas. Until this occurs, elementary school teachers should rely on tradebooks rather than reading textbooks in teaching reading. Goodman, Freeman, Murphy, and Shannon (1987) concur in noting that although publishers may try to include texts written by well-respected authors, these texts are often freely adapted or excerpted rather than presented in their original form and content. The continuing practice of censorship of form and content through deletions and revisions by controlled vocabulary and syntax has led a California panel reviewing new reading textbooks for future adoption to call for a "consumer warning label" that will alert teachers and parents to the inclusion of altered material in the reading textbooks (Rothman, 1988).

In response to the criticisms, alternative instructional reading programs are being proposed and attempted. One group of alternatives places the reading of tradebooks at the core of the instructional program. Just who is responsible for the selection of texts, however, remains a subject for debate. Some educators advocate the identification of a relatively standard list of classics and high-quality contemporary literature that American students should read as part of an "ideal curriculum" during the elementary school years (Bennett, 1988). Despite the appeal of proposals to ensure that all children will read the best of children's literature during their elementary school years, it quickly becomes apparent that it is virtually impossible to identify a list of books that are appropriate and meaningful for all students. Should we try to do this, Ohanian (1988) argues, we are in danger of producing "a generation of aliterates," people who know how to read but don't.

A second group maintains that the selection of texts must rest largely with teachers and students. The lack of standardization promotes the likelihood that selected books will be appropriate and meaningful for particular students, although it also ensures considerable variability in reading material from student to student and classroom to classroom. In addition, the instructional context in which students read and respond to tradebooks is considerably variable from one classroom to the next. Some teachers will lead a tradebook discussion within a traditional reading group context, using guided reading procedures,

commercially available response guides (Somers & Worthington, 1979; Troy & Green, 1987), literary analysis extension activities (Cullinan, 1987; Graves & Hansen, 1983; Hains, 1982; Johnson & Louis, 1987; Kahn, Walter, & Johannessen, 1984; Lamme, 1981), or their own interpretation of a text to organize the instruction. Others, however, are attempting to develop student-dominated "literature study groups" in which the teacher is primarily a "listener," "facilitator," or "participant," and the goal of instruction is the reader's personal response to a text through active participation in the processes of reading and writing (Watson & Davis, 1988). In Hansen's (1987) experience, for example, these programs are successful alternatives to traditional instruction for the following reasons. First, substantial amounts of time are spent writing and reading real books. Second, teachers and children have the freedom to make choices regarding the content of their reading and writing. Third, the focus of instruction is the reader's or writer's response to the evoked story. Fourth, reading and writing process classrooms are structured and organized. Finally, there is a community spirit within the classroom in which students and teachers support one another in cooperative learning.

Unfortunately, however, when decisions as to text selection and instructional methods are left entirely to the individual teacher or school, the potential for chaos in the teaching of reading exists. The lack of a specific curriculum, a relatively standard selection of texts for instructional purposes, and the continuity of agreement as to which reading abilities are introduced, developed, or evaluated during a given year of school results in considerable variability in instructional contexts from classroom to classroom. In one classroom, the program works very well; in another, however, significant numbers of children do not make the progress that had been anticipated when the teachers embraced the whole language, literature-based reading program as an alternative to the developmental reading program.

To solve this problem, some schools have chosen a second alternative to traditional reading programs. They are attempting to use a developmental reading program and supplemental reading abilities workbooks, but to bolster that approach by the inclusion of tradebooks and reading process and writing process activities within the instructional program. As with the first alternative, however, this approach also is subject to considerable variability from one classroom to the next. One teacher relies heavily on the developmental program, providing relatively few opportunities for students to read tradebooks during the year. Another teacher provides many opportunities for students to read tradebooks, leaving the developmental program aside for the most part. Implicit in this approach, thus, is the possibility that instead of getting the "best of both worlds," the student will end up as "master of none."

A third alternative is to purchase the most recently published developmental reading program. In 1986-87, the state of California issued a report, the *English-Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools, K-12*, which calls for literature-based reading programs. Largely as a result of this shift in curriculum emphasis, all publishers who now wish their reading programs to be considered for adoption in California have submitted materials that are either new versions of traditional programs such as *Heath Reading* (D. C. Heath, 1989), or are new programs developed to respond specifically to the report such as *Literary Readers* (Houghton-Mifflin, 1989). These programs may also include a tradebook library and supplementary materials for the teaching of specific reading and writing abilities.

Just how successful the new generation of developmental reading programs will be in balancing a selection of higher quality texts, promoting reading and writing processes as part of the instructional program, and providing a continuity of instruction across grades remains to be seen. The success of the new programs will depend in part on the extent to which the answers to the following questions offer an approach to the teaching of reading that is distinctly different from that offered in earlier basal readers.

Are the selections in the reading textbooks or accompanying libraries examples of literary classics or high-quality contemporary, multicultural fiction? Are they reasonably well known or are they unknown but written by well-known authors? Are they examples of original, complete, unadapted works or have they been substantially excerpted or distorted?

How are the texts organized within the textbook? Does the organization emphasize important historical, scientific, artistic, cultural, or psychological themes that are appropriate to the developmental interests of the students? Does it highlight significant aspects of literature or the literary devices used by writers?

How does instruction in reading occur? Is the emphasis of discussion on comprehension of ideas or on the student's response to and interpretation of the text? Do students discuss the literary qualities of a text within the discussion or are they asked to complete workbook activities related to particular literary features? Are students given ample opportunities to engage in process-oriented reading and writing as part of the reading instructional program? Do teachers encourage the expression of multiple viewpoints in the course of discussion? Do the guide materials support multiple viewpoints or discourage them by providing the teacher with a script of questions to ask and answers to expect? What opportunities are provided for students to read selections of their own choosing? Do students have an opportunity to explore content topics, integrating their reading of fiction and nonfiction? How much of the reading instructional time is devoted to skillwork or activities that are tenuously related to the reading of "real books?"

In sum, the current alternatives to earlier developmental reading programs have both strengths and weaknesses. When decisions on the choice of instructional context are made by individual teachers or schools, teachers gain greater control of text selection and instructional methods. With the control, however, also comes the responsibility to select texts wisely and to develop instructional methods that help students learn not only to read and write but to appreciate quality in their reading and writing. In contrast, when decisions on the choice of instructional context are made by publishers or curriculum "experts," teachers are likely to lose some control of text selection and instructional methods. They may, however, also gain continuity in instruction by means of a standard curriculum and selection of texts.

Insight Into Literature

Insight Into Literature's core instructional context extends the re-creation of a story beyond evocation and personal response to the interpretation of literary form and content. The guiding principle in developing the instructional context is that experience in interpreting literature enriches the reader's appreciation of literary quality. To highlight the interplay of text quality and instructional method, only well-known texts of unquestionable literary merit or appeal are read. The instructional method emphasizes a "sociocognitive" (Langer, 1986) view of the reading process coupled with a focus on literary form and content.

A Sociocognitive View of the Reading Process

Reading as a communicative act. The degree to which readers benefit from a social, spoken context in re-creating a story or in establishing communication with the distant writer varies with the complexity of the text and the purpose of the reading as well as with the individual's expertise. Participation in discussions of texts in which readers share their responses to or interpretations of a story, however, is often advantageous to both novice and experienced readers. As texts become more complex, the value of collaborative re-creation increases because the social, spoken language communicative context serves as an important mediator of the communication between the real writer and the real readers.

During the preschool years, the face-to-face conversational context in which young children communicate with their parents is often critical to the success of the communication. When children begin to show interest in written language by early reading or writing, they rely upon spoken language to communicate the meaning of written language. Preschool teachers draw upon the young child's verbal competence in building natural literacy. Group storyreading (Cochran-Smith, 1984), for example, is one important technique that preschool teachers use to mediate the communication between the real writer and the real readers. When an adult reader and several children engage in group storyreading, they cooperatively re-create the text's meaning as the story is read aloud. The adult reader as well as the children are free to interrupt the reading to pose questions, to respond to questions or comments made by others, to refer to illustrations, or to imbue the reading with knowledge gained from prior experience.

What may seem like a disconcerting presentation of the story becomes a highly involving social activity in which spoken language envelops the written text.

Cochran-Smith characterizes the adult's role in group storyreading as that of meaning mediator who bridges the communication between the real writer and the real readers. As mediator, the adult often represents the writer by reading the actual story. If the adult reader believes that the experience of the children does not match that of the implied readers for whom the text was written, however, the storyreader becomes a commentator who leads the group in a discussion of the text's meaning. Cochran-Smith observes that comments on the text often take the form of one of two types of interactions: text-to-life and life-to-text. In text-to-life interactions, information, ideas, and concepts gained from text reading are used in solving everyday problems. In life-to-text interactions, each participant's knowledge of language and of the world is drawn upon to help the group understand important story elements. Participation in activities such as group storyreading thus affords young children an opportunity to contextualize reading by drawing upon their competence as speakers.

Yet, all too often, the social context that characterizes the early language and literacy environment at home and at preschool becomes less prominent as children advance through elementary school. As children become more independent in their reading and writing, opportunities to work cooperatively with other students are often replaced with decontextualized or non-collaborative assignments. How then can we reassert the importance of the social context in which writing and reading take place during the elementary school years? One way is to incorporate into the instructional context for reading a consistent commitment to sharing responses to and interpretations of texts by means of discussion and writing.

Insight Into Literature draws upon whole language and reading and writing process research in creating an environment in which students act as mediators to bridge the communication between writer and reader. The instructional context supports the community-of-readers concept in which each student feels free to share a personal response because he or she knows that all interpretations are valid as well as that responses can be modified as the result of participation in group activities.

Students engage frequently in activities such as cooperative storyretelling to share their re-creations of story. Cooperative storyretelling serves as a summarization technique for main ideas and as an introduction to discussion or writing related to aspects of the text that are the subject of interpretation. Storyretelling shifts the focus of discussion from teacher-dominated questions on the literal comprehension of a story's plot to the group's cooperative re-creation of a story. Beyond storyretelling, students use response diaries to record their personal impressions of books and dialogue journals to share their informal responses with others. More formal responses that further the children's appreciation of reading as a social, communicative act are included as extension activities. Examples of extension activities that promote whole language and reading and writing processes include role-playing a character's point of view (Cullinan, 1987), role-playing the author's point of view (Graves & Hansen, 1983), creating video book commercials, and writing letters to a favorite author.

Reading as a cognitive act. Responding to literature, however, is not only a social act but also a cognitive act. To help young readers begin to understand how cognition contributes to their appreciation and interpretation of a story, *Insight Into Literature* extends the whole language communicative environment to include instructional methods that highlight the problem-solving strategies experienced readers use in re-creating stories.

Reciprocal teaching (Palinscar & Brown, 1984) is an example of a cognitive apprenticeship (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1987) instructional method that focuses specifically upon cognitive strategies used in responding to or interpreting text rather than the general social context in which reading and writing occurs. The strategies emphasize process and are considered "content-free," implying that they can be used in responding to or interpreting many different types of texts. The usefulness of the strategies is not limited to nonfiction for they are also appropriate in the study of fiction.

Reciprocal teaching creates an apprenticeship environment in which an experienced reader and several novice readers engage in the act of reading a meaningful text. As they read and discuss a particular segment, they use a structured pattern of four cognitive, problem-solving strategies to monitor their re-creation of the text: questioning, clarifying, summarizing, and predicting. Initially, the role of the experienced reader is dominant as he or she models the use of the strategies. However, each novice reader also has an opportunity to act as the experienced reader in leading discussion on succeeding segments of text, in coaching the group members on the use of the strategies, and in helping the group to re-create meaning collaboratively. As the novice readers gain competence, the dominance of the experienced reader or the novice reader acting as leader fades, and the group members achieve equal status as competent readers responding to or interpreting literature.

Five steps are involved in the instructional method. First, the experienced reader or the novice acting as leader poses a question that asks the group to consider an important idea in the text segment that has been read. Because self-questioning is considered essential to the interpretation of literature, the goal of this step is to help students learn that all readers must ask themselves questions about text meaning as they read. Second, the group responds to the question, referring to the text in support of particular viewpoints. The group is encouraged to refer to the text itself in responding to the question. In the course of responding to or interpreting the text, group members learn that reading can be thought of as a special instance of more general problem solving. Third, group members ask follow-up questions to explore further a particular idea until it becomes apparent that the topic has been addressed fully. The questions and responses by members of the group provide an indication as to the degree to which the process results in a consensus of interpretation. Fourth, the experienced reader summarizes the varying interpretations of the text that group members presented. Finally, the experienced reader predicts what is likely to follow in the next segment. The prediction guides future reading, providing the group members with a means to evaluate their interpretations as they continue to read and to engage in further conversation.

The intent of both reciprocal teaching and cooperative storyretelling is to make aspects of the reading process visible. Whereas cooperative storyretelling provides a scaffold for reading as a communicative act, reciprocal teaching provides a scaffold for reading as a cognitive act. In neither case do these instructional methods demand that the students achieve consensus of interpretation, although this may sometimes occur. More often, however, it is likely that individuals will moderate disparate views in the course of discussion. It is also possible, of course, that group members are not able to agree nor are they willing to negotiate, resulting in an impasse. What is important is not consensus of interpretation, but that students share their responses to a text with others, observe that different people respond to texts in different ways, and learn that a reader's re-creation of a story is subject to change as his or her understanding of the story broadens. To achieve these goals, *Insight Into Literature* highlights sociocognitive instructional methods.

Literary Form and Content

A primary goal of *Insight Into Literature* is to help readers understand that their ability to re-create a story arises in part from their prior experience of literary form and content. Through interpretation, students gain a deeper appreciation of literature.

> To fully appreciate a work of fiction, the reader must be able to respond appropriately to the literary tactics used by the writer to structure feeling into story import. (Parker, 1969, p. 12)

Among the elements of fiction that readers consider in creating interpretations of literature are literary form features such as setting, plot, character, point of view, style and tone, and symbol and metaphor, and literary content features such as theme and genre (Boynton & Maynard, 1985; Hall, 1987; Hersey, 1981; Parker, 1969; Pickering & Hoeper, 1982). Within the *Insight Into Literature* instructional context, reading, discussion, and writing are focused upon those elements of form and content that are significant components of a particular text. Readers consider both the independent contributions of the individual elements to the structure of a story and the integration of the elements within the whole text.

For example, one important element of literary form students may study is character. Among the aspects of character the teacher is likely to address during instruction are those qualities that distinguish memorable protagonists and antagonists. Because fiction often succeeds or fails on the "roundness" of characters (Forster, 1927, as cited by Hersey, 1981; Hall, 1987), it is important for students to read a variety of high-quality texts in which the creation of character is central to the success of the story. As students contrast the qualities of multidimensional and "dynamic" characters with those who are "flat" or "one-dimensional" in discussion and writing, they begin to understand the importance of character development in the creation of enduring fiction.

Another aspect of character the teacher is likely to address is the creation of believable characters. Young readers often read and enjoy realistic fiction, a genre that demands the characters be believable. Writers typically use two means to create characters who behave consistently unless motivated to alter their behavior by underlying goals or beliefs. First, the writer may directly tell the reader how to view a character by the choice of a character's name, the description of physical traits, educational background, social and economic status, or interests, or the exposition of values, thoughts, emotions, beliefs, or perceptions. Second, the writer may indirectly show the reader aspects of character by creating anecdotal scenes in which the characters interact with one another as they attempt to carry out plans that will help them achieve their goals. By both direct and indirect means, the writer creates an inside view of the character's thoughts, emotions, or perceptions (Bruce, 1984, 1985; Steinberg & Bruce, 1980), and a character-plans structure that includes essential beliefs and goals. The reader's re-creation of inside view and character plans, in turn, helps him or her interpret character interactions as the events of the plot unfold (Bruce, 1978, 1980; Bruce & Newman, 1978).

> Characters are not born like people, of woman; they are born of a situation, a sentence, a metaphor containing in a nutshell a basic human possibility that the author thinks no one else has discovered or said something essential about. (Kundera, 1984, p. 221)

The teacher is also likely to address the use of character as a mediator of the writer-reader communication. As Kundera implies in the passage above, writers often create characters to convey important insights about human nature. Whether the reader understands an idea in the manner intended by the writer, however, is far less important than the reader's insights about humanity that are realized on the basis of his or her response to or interpretation of character. The integration of insights on human nature arising from the reading of a text with prior knowledge of life and literature contributes both to the reader's appreciation of literature and to his or her continuously evolving views of life.

Resource materials for creating and organizing *Insight Into Literature* units are readily available (e.g. Moss, 1984). The selection of original, unadapted classics and contemporary multicultural fiction may be organized by author, literary form features such as setting, plot, character, and device, or literary content features such as theme and genre.

Once the texts are selected, it is important that teachers read and respond to the texts prior to discussing the stories with groups of children. The teacher may want to collect examples of varying interpretations of a story which, along with his or her own interpretation, can serve as resources for instruction. Response guides as well as literary analysis techniques such as interacting plans analysis (Bruce, 1978; Newman & Bruce, 1986; Steinberg, 1981) and story grammar (Stein & Glenn, 1979) or theories which focus on story liking (Jose, 1988) may prove useful in developing instructional activities. Extension activities which are derived from literary analysis techniques include character attribute webs, literary sociograms, and story maps (Cullinan, 1987).

In sum, the significant features of *Insight Into Literature's* core instructional context include: (a) the reading of original, unadapted classics and contemporary multicultural fiction; (b) sociocognitive instructional methods; and (c) a focus on literary form and content. The next section of this report presents an experiment that contrasted *Insight Into Literature* and other instructional contexts for reading as it explored the contributions of instructional method and text quality to the young reader's ability to interpret inside view and character plans in fiction.

Method

Subjects and Design

Thirty-six children, 18 girls and 18 boys, in Grade 3 served as subjects. The children were selected randomly from the population of Grade 3 students attending a northeastern, suburban, public elementary school.

Prior to the selection of the sample, all of the children were rated by their teachers as Strong (1), Average (2) or Weak (3) in their ability to interpret literature. Twelve students, 6 boys and 6 girls, were selected randomly from each of these groups. One boy and one girl from each of the ability groupings were randomly assigned to one of six groups in the 3 x 2 (Instructional Method x Text Type) factorial design. Treatment conditions were randomly assigned to the groups: no instruction/original text (control); no instruction/basal text (control); *Insight Into Literature*/original text; *Insight Into Literature*/basal text; traditional instruction/original text; and traditional instruction/basal text. The groups were diverse with respect to the students' competence in the interpretation of literature, although all of the children were judged by their teachers to be capable of reading the texts.

Materials

The original version of *Freckle Juice* (Blume, 1971) and an adaptation of the story appearing in a basal reading series served as the texts for the experimental investigation. *Freckle Juice* is an example of an engaging contemporary story commonly enjoyed by children in grades 1-3. It is the story of a boy, Andrew Marcus, who wants freckles so badly that he will do just about anything to get them.

Text analysis. *Freckle Juice* was selected initially for text analysis from a corpus of original stories and their basal reader adaptations. The corpus was collected to study the literary features of texts that contribute to their complexity and to the reader's involvement in stories. Sentence-by-sentence contrasts of the original stories and their adaptations revealed editorial changes to the originals that appeared to have altered their quality. One common type of editorial change was the deletion of large segments of text.

The basal version of *Freckle Juice* is an example of an adaptation in which many of the passages of the original text were deleted. Approximately one-third of the 500 sentences comprising the original version of the story were deleted in the basal adaptation. To understand more fully how these deletions influence a reader's interpretation of the story, Liebling (1989a) divided the original text into three social sequences, examining Social Sequence 1 in detail. Social Sequence 1 (SS1) consists of sentences 1-200 of the original text. Of the 200 sentences that comprise Social Sequence 1 in the original version of the story, 84, or 42% of the total, were deleted in the basal version. Further analysis revealed that 72% of the sentences containing ideas about Andrew's relationship with his mother were deleted; 35% of the sentences containing ideas about Andrew's relationship with his peer, Sharon, were deleted; and, 42% of the sentences containing ideas about Andrew's relationship with his teacher were deleted.

To study the ways in which content deletions alter the meaning of the original story, an inside view and interacting plans analysis was undertaken. The analysis represented pictorially the relationships between the actions comprising the Cooperative Interaction Plan in which Andrew and Sharon participate, Andrew's and Sharon's independent goals and essential beliefs, and inside views of Andrew and Sharon.

The analysis suggested that the interpretation of inside view and character plans arising from a reading of the original version differs from that arising from a reading of the adaptation. This occurs because some of the segments that were deleted from the adaptation contain information that helps the reader build representations of the characters and their interactions. For example, several important episodes in which Blume shows the reader how Andrew feels as he interacts with Sharon and his peers were deleted from the adaptation. These episodes establish interpersonal conflict as an important element of the plot, providing young readers with a reason to relate the interactions of the characters to their peer relationships. While such passages may have been deleted to remove potentially controversial

dialogue, the effect of the deletions is to deny the reader important clues as to the motivation for Andrew's and Sharon's actions. Thus, the reader's interpretation of the story is likely to differ with respect to the particular version which has been read.

The text analysis was used as a tool to help the experienced reader in planning instruction on the literary features of *Freckle Juice*.

Experimental Procedures

Instructional contexts. The students in the *Insight Into Literature* instructional groups were asked to read independently the texts to which they were assigned. While reading the story, they were asked to think about questions concerning the characters and their relationships they might want to pose during the group discussion. They also were asked to think about people they knew who were like those in the story and whether they had ever tried to do the sorts of things the characters in the story were doing. Students in the traditional instructional groups as well as those in the control groups were asked to read the story independently although they were not given specific instructions other than to discuss it, if they wished, with members of their families.

Those students who were to participate in reading conferences met with one of two experienced readers. To plan instruction for the *Insight Into Literature* groups, one experienced reader relied upon the interacting plans and inside view analysis in creating a guide to organize the reading conference and to decide which aspects of the text should be emphasized during the discussion. The second experienced reader reviewed the basal text's teacher's manual in preparation for her participation in the traditional reading conferences. Students assigned to the control groups did not participate in reading conferences.

The *Insight Into Literature* instructional methods were similar for both groups, regardless of the text read. First, there was a prereading discussion of life experiences related to important themes in the story. Second, the experienced reader explained the purpose of the reading conference and described the activities in which the group would participate. Third, the students participated in a reading conference. Each story was divided into three social sequences, as identified in the text analysis. Each social sequence was then divided into a number of segments for purposes of discussion. Social Sequence 1, for example, was divided into three segments. Students were asked to reread silently each segment of the text that would be discussed. After rereading the segment, students engaged in cooperative storyretelling. They were then asked to write two questions regarding character that they wanted to pose to the group. The discussion proceeded as a reciprocal dialogue in which comprehension-monitoring strategies were used in interpreting inside view and character plans in the story.

The traditional instructional methods were also similar for both groups, regardless of the text that had been read. The experienced reader followed the instructions provided in the teacher's manual. First, she engaged the students in vocabulary exercises in which particular words appearing in the story were singled out for special attention. Second, she introduced the story. Third, she asked the students to reread silently a portion of the text, followed by "comprehension check" questions related to the portion. These questions were provided in the teacher's manual, as were the suggested student answers.

Storyretelling. Over the course of one week following the reading conferences, each student who participated in an instructional group, as well as those who did not, met individually with an experienced reader to retell the story. Each interview was approximately 20 minutes long. The students were asked to retell each social sequence and to try to weave within their retellings of main events inside view and character plans concepts which might help them interpret the events. For Social Sequence 1, the students were asked to try to include the following within their retellings: The actions and dialogue comprising the Cooperative Interaction Plan; inside views of Andrew and Sharon and of their relationship; and Andrew's and Sharon's independent goals and essential beliefs. The students were encouraged to refer to the text if they wished, but they were asked to retell the story in their own words rather than to read it.

Data Analysis

The reading conferences and storyretellings were audiotaped. The transcripts of the audiotapes served as the data source for the analyses. Reading conferences were analyzed qualitatively. Storyretellings related to the three segments of text comprising Social Sequence 1 were analyzed quantitatively.

Instructional contexts. The reading conference transcripts were coded to identify the speaker and the speaker's role as well as the type of activity to which the speaker contributed. The *Insight Into Literature* activities included cooperative storyretelling, reciprocal dialogue, and focused discussion. The traditional activity was guided reading. The patterns of questions and responses as well as the frequency with which individuals dominated the discussion were also noted. Additional details further identified the speaker's contribution: mediator of the writer/reader communication; super-facilitator in organizing the process; teacher within a "teachable moment"; or, commentator in offering text references or text-to-life or life-to-text statements in support of the interpretation. For example, a student leader poses a question (reciprocal dialogue - question) to help the group consider Andrew's beliefs about his problems (focused discussion, literary content - essential beliefs). The coded transcripts were used as the basis of the qualitative analysis of the alternative instructional contexts.

Storyretellings. The storyretelling protocols were coded for the presence of ideas related to the following: the actions comprising the Cooperative Interaction Plan in which Andrew and Sharon participate; inside views of Andrew and Sharon; and Andrew's and Sharon's independent goals and essential beliefs. Each different idea related to these categories was given 1 point. Whether the students' responses were in agreement with the experienced reader's analysis of the text or reflected consensus opinions expressed during the group discussion was not important. The intent of quantifying the responses was to contrast differences in the storyretellings with respect to the experimental conditions.

The retelling protocols were scored independently by two scorers. The interrater reliability was .85. In cases of disagreement, the student's score equaled the average of the independent ratings.

A 3 x 2 (Instructional Method: *Insight Into Literature* vs. Traditional vs. No Instruction x Text Type: Original vs. Basal Adaptation) posttest-only design was employed. The independent variables, instructional method and text type, were between-subjects factors. A separate ANOVA (Clear Lake Research, 1986) was conducted for each of three dependent variable scores: Cooperative Interaction Plan, inside view, and character plans. Significant effects were investigated further with the help of post hoc contrasts of means.

Results

Instructional Contexts

The qualitative analysis of the transcripts revealed several important differences in the instructional contexts. These differences concerned the prereading activity, the experienced reader's scaffolding of the reading conference's purpose and procedures, and the social, cognitive, and literary aspects of the discussions.

Prereading. The prereading activity for the *Insight Into Literature* instructional groups began with an emphasis on life experiences. The experienced reader urged the students to use their prior knowledge of people to establish a context for the discussion of the story.

> ER: Sometimes you can use your own experiences to help you understand why characters do what they do in a story. Before we talk about *Freckle Juice*, I'd like you to think for a moment about life in the third grade. What are kids like in the third grade? How do boys and girls get along? Are kids happy with the way they look? What kinds of problems do third graders have? What do kids like about their parents or their teachers?

The experienced reader (ER) asked the students whether they had any questions to ask the group that might help everyone think about such themes as boy-girl relationships in school, satisfaction or dissatisfaction with one's appearance, self-concept, and qualities admired in parents and teachers. Among the several questions that were posed were the following:

JG: Is there a part of you that you don't like too much?

KH: My hair.

ER: Your hair? If you could change it, what would you do?

KH: I'd try to look like Cindy Lauper. I'd spray hair spray and I'd static my hair all up and I'd color it all different colors.

SC: My face. I wish I was pretty.

KH: Me too. I don't like my face either.

ER: Oh my. SC doesn't think she's pretty and neither does KH.

KH: But, you are both very pretty! What about you CZ?

CZ: My arms! I don't have big enough muscles.

ER: You'll have those some day. What about you, CC?

CC: Long legs, I'm too short. I'm only four foot four.

JG: Well, I don't like my fingers and my toes because they never grow long. My nails, they never grow long. They always just break, and plus, I can't play the piano with long fingers. I wish I could have those magic fingers so I could shrink them up and down.

ER: That would be neat. What about you, JB?

JB: My teeth are always loose. Oh yeah, and I want to have whiter teeth.

CC: Me too.

ER: You know, every couple of years, I get so fed up with the way that I look that I decide to get a perm. The only problem is that I never like the perm and I have to wait months and months before it grows out. When my hair is curly, I want it straight, and when it's straight, I want it curly. Well, it seems that all of us don't like something about the way we look, but do you think that you could change your life in some way or that you could solve a problem if you changed your looks?

In contrast to the *Insight Into Literature* prereading emphasis on life experience in setting the stage for the discussion, the prereading activity for the traditional instructional groups emphasized individual vocabulary words found in the story.

ER: Before we start I wanted to mention a few words in the story that seem to be fairly important. I want to see if you know what they mean. What about the word "aisle." If you walk down the aisle, where are you walking?

AS: From the teacher's desk or somewhere between things.

ER: Yes, ok. What about average?

SW: Well, my report card, I'm an average student, meaning you're not bad but you're not great. You're ok for your level.

The teacher then asked the students to answer several questions using the vocabulary words.

ER: You put this on sandwiches. It looks white and creamy. The first three letters name a month.

JM: Mayonnaise. It's something made with eggs and cream and sort of disgusting.

ER: Eggs and oil.

JM: Well, I don't know what the ingredients are, but it's yucky to taste, and you put it in sandwiches and egg salad.

After asking the students to answer several queries, the experienced reader realized that it was unnecessary to complete all of the suggested vocabulary exercises.

ER: I think you understand those words quite well so we're going to go ahead.

Scaffolding. The intent of the *Insight Into Literature* scaffold was to present an explicit statement of the purpose of the conference and the procedures the group would follow. In stating the purpose of the conference, the experienced reader tried to bridge the prereading discussion of life experience to the story's major themes that would be addressed during the conference.

ER: The story you have read at home which we will be discussing today is *Freckle Juice* by Judy Blume. *Freckle Juice* is a funny story, but it has serious themes about kids and how they feel about themselves and about others. In fact, many of the questions we have been discussing such as wishing you were like somebody else, trying to change the way you look, behaving strangely, or relying on someone who isn't a true friend relate to the themes in the story. *Freckle Juice* is a good example of a story in which the personal qualities of the characters and their relationships to one another are important. Judy Blume has created a main character or protagonist, Andrew Marcus, and an antagonist, Sharon, as well as several minor characters. Andrew and Sharon may even be a lot like some of you. As you know, Andrew wants freckles very badly. The writer has created situations in which Andrew talks to other characters and does certain things in the hope of getting freckles. As we discuss the story and think about what the characters are saying and doing, each of us will be able to re-create Andrew and the other characters. We will understand Andrew's and Sharon's actions in terms of their goals and most important beliefs as well as their thoughts and feelings. To help us interpret character in the story, we will rely on what we know about the characters in this story, what we know about the writing of stories, and what we know about elementary school kids and their relationships with one another, parents, and teachers.

The experienced reader then described the procedures the groups would follow in discussing either the original or adapted versions of the story.

ER: We're going to read this story in a way that's a little bit different from what you usually do. I'm going to begin by identifying a part of the story that I want you to reread silently. After we have reread the part, one of us will begin to retell it. After telling a small portion, the storyreteller will pause and the person sitting next to him or her will pick up where the first person left off. We will continue this way until we have retold the part of the story. When it is your turn, you can add details that someone else may have forgotten or you can correct what you may think were misstatements.

> Before we begin our discussion, I would like you to write down one or two questions regarding the characters which you want to ask the group. We will then share our interpretations of the characters and their relationships. Each of us will have a chance to ask and to respond to questions as we think about the characters. I will not be asking all the questions and waiting for you to give me the answers. Instead, I hope that you will discuss the story with each other as well as with me. Although there will be times when I will propose certain ideas and I will express my opinions, I want you to know that your ideas and opinions are just as important as are mine. The point of the discussion is to share our ideas as we build interpretations of character in the story. We may have different interpretations, and we may disagree with one another. This is part of discussing a story with other people.
>
> For each part of the story, one of us will be the group leader. The group leader will begin by asking a question to help the group think about the characters. We want to think about who they are, what they're thinking and feeling, and why they are doing certain things. That's all very important. It is the leader's job to encourage all of us to respond to the question, to ask follow-up questions, and to keep the discussion focused on a particular topic. I will help the leader, if necessary. After the leader has asked a question and the rest of us have had a chance to respond, the leader may ask whether anyone has another question to ask. When there are no other questions to ask regarding a part of the story, the leader will summarize the discussion of character and predict what will happen to the characters in the next part. Then someone else will be the leader.
>
> When we have completed our discussion, we will have worked together to re-create *Freckle Juice*. We will have used our life experiences and our understanding of the writer's creation of character to build our interpretations of the story. Maybe we will even learn some things from the story which will help us solve problems in our own lives. And, hopefully, we will have gained an appreciation of the story's literary qualities.

The scaffold for the traditional groups began with an introduction to the story. The experienced reader told the students that they would be discussing *Freckle Juice* by Judy Blume. She said, "The story is about a boy named Andrew Marcus who wishes he had a million freckles, like his friend Nicky." She then noted the procedures both the original and adapted text groups would follow during the conference.

> ER: We're going to start to tell the story together. We're not going to read it, but I'll tell you what we're going to do. I will tell you a couple of pages that I just want you to look over to yourselves silently. The first two pages that I want you to look at are 317 and 318. Ok. Now in these first two pages, we'd like you to pay a lot of attention to what Andrew wanted and why he wanted them. After you reread the pages, I'll ask you several questions. One person can answer the question and then if anybody else wants to say anything they can.

Reading conferences. The following portions of the transcript for the *Insight Into Literature*/original text group refer to Reading Segment A (RSA) of Social Sequence 1 (SS1) for which there were 121 turns of conversation.

RSA introduces Andrew Marcus as the protagonist and Sharon as the antagonist. Andrew's goal of wanting freckles is identified. Andrew's essential beliefs regarding problems and conflicts he has with his mother at home and with his peers and teacher at school are developed as the motivation for Andrew's actions. The reader is given a glimpse of Andrew's and Sharon's interpersonal conflict within a reading group scene. After reading RSA, it becomes possible to begin to re-create the characters of Andrew and Sharon and to see how important character is to the development of this story.

The discussion of RSA began with a cooperative storyretelling.

> ER: OK. I'm going to begin so that you get an idea about how we're gonna do it. I'll retell a bit of the story. When I stop, CC will continue. When he stops, JG will continue. Then,

KH, JB, and CZ and SC. Ok? Well, in this part Andrew really wants freckles. Andrew sits behind Nicky who has lots of freckles.

CC: Well, Andrew wants to get freckles. He thinks if he had freckles, his mother wouldn't know if his neck was dirty. And then he wouldn't have to wash before school. You see, he's always late for school because he has to go and wash.

JG: Well, another thing is that he also gets in trouble in school a lot because he doesn't pay attention. He daydreams about freckles instead of doing his work. Then the teacher gets mad at him and the other kids laugh at him.

KH: Yeah, like in the reading group. He didn't come when the teacher called the group. When he finally came, the kids were ready to read, but he wasn't. He couldn't find the page. The kids are laughing, especially Sharon. She picks on him, makes fun of him. She's laughing. She's a know-it-all.

JB: Anyway, he finally finds his page. He thinks if he had freckles, things like this would never happen.

CZ: OK. So after school, he runs into Nicky and asks him how he got his freckles. Nicky thinks that's pretty stupid and so does Andrew. He felt stupid. Nicky said, "What'd you mean? I was born with them."

In the cooperative storyretelling, all members of the group participated by offering a retelling of a portion of the segment rather than by responding to main idea, literal recall questions posed by the experienced reader. The cooperative retelling established a foundation for the discussion of character in this segment. Within the retelling, the group identified Andrew, Sharon, and Nicky and established Andrew's goal of wanting to get freckles, and his essential beliefs concerning his problems with his mother at home and with his teacher and peers at school. The group learned a little bit about Andrew and Sharon as individuals as well as the nature of their interpersonal conflict. However, the inner lives of Andrew and Sharon were not explored, suggesting that an exploration of the characters' inner lives was an appropriate topic for the insight discussion to follow.

The cooperative storyretelling of RSA generated a reciprocal dialogue in which the question, response, clarification, summary, and prediction comprehension-monitoring strategies were used. The six primary questions focused the dialogue on literary content, specifically emphasizing character as an important aspect of the story. The focus questions included: (1) What kind of boy was Andrew in this story? (2) What problems did Andrew think he had? (3) How did Andrew feel about Sharon? (4) Do you think that Sharon liked Andrew? (5) What kind of person would ask someone how they got freckles? (6) What do we know about Andrew's and Sharon's plans so far? The focus questions provided the group with an opportunity to re-create the characters' inner lives as they considered inside view and character plans.

For example, consider this insight discussion regarding focus questions 3 and 4. JG had just led a discussion based on focus questions 1 and 2. She then asked the group if anyone else had a question to pose.

JG: Does anyone else have a question they want to ask?

ER: (after a pause) Can you think of a question which might help us talk about Andrew's and Sharon's relationship?

JG: SC?

SC: How did Andrew feel about Sharon in this story? JB?

JB: He thinks that she's kind of pretty and he thinks that Sharon likes him because she's always laughing and stuff like that.

JG: Well, I don't think so. I think that he hates her and I think that she hates him too, because she's . . . he probably thinks that she's like a lizard or something. She always runs her tongue along her teeth, and she's always trying to get money out of people so I think she's probably a loser.

CC: Yeah, a cheapskate

ER: A loser, a cheapskate? What do you think, KH?

KH: Well, when he isn't listening, she starts laughing. It says, "His reading group giggled, especially Sharon. He couldn't stand that Sharon."

SC: So why couldn't he stand her?

KH: Because she was giggling and she thought she knew everything.

SC: Right. They don't seem much like friends to me. What do you think?

CC: In the picture it looks like she wants him to see that she's laughing because she's like embarrassing him. He's embarrassed.

CZ: They're definitely not friends. I'd say they were enemies.

ER: Have you ever heard the word "adversary?"

CZ: No.

ER: Well, we might call Andrew and Sharon "adversaries." They seem to be rivals or opponents. In the story, Andrew is considered the protagonist while Sharon is considered the "antagonist" which is another word for adversary. So it seems that Andrew doesn't like Sharon too much. But what about Sharon? How does she feel about Andrew?

SC: She thinks she can make fun of Andrew.

CZ: Yeah. She thinks she's big--smart.

JG: Yeah. She thinks she can make a fool of Andrew. She could get away with it.

CC: She won't get in trouble.

JB: Oh yes, she will. The teacher will get back at her.

The experienced reader then used the insight discussion thus far as a context for the following "teachable moment":

ER: I'd like to pause for a moment to talk about some of the ways that Judy Blume creates the characters in this story. Let's go back to the first page. One of the ways is to tell you rather directly some important ideas. What does she tell us?

JG: She tells us that Andrew wants freckles. She tells us why he wants freckles--about his mother and washing.

ER: That's right. And then sometimes she doesn't tell us what she thinks is important, but she shows us. She gives us examples. The characters do certain things or they say certain things. We have to decide what those things mean. Can you find an example in which Judy Blume shows us important ideas about Andrew?

CC: Well, she shows us that he's a daydreamer and that he gets in trouble at school.

CZ: And she shows us that the other kids like Sharon think it's funny when Andrew can't find his place in the book when it's time for reading.

ER: Yes, that's excellent. As we go along and discuss the rest of the story, you might want to think about what you are learning about the characters that's very clearly stated in the text and what you are learning as you think about the characters' conversations and actions.

After discussing focus questions 5 and 6, JG was asked to summarize the different points of view regarding the characters and to predict what would happen to the characters in Reading Segment B (RSB). Regarding an inside view of Andrew, for example, JG noted the following: First, Andrew wants to change his looks. Second, his plan is to get freckles somehow, but we don't know how yet. Third, Andrew seems kind of shy and always wants something someone else has. Fourth, he seems very gullible when he asks Nicky how to get freckles. Fifth, KH feels that Andrew is a know-it-all, but JG thinks it is Sharon who is a know-it-all. Sixth, JG thinks Andrew is kind of smart, although he isn't using "it," while CC thinks Andrew is kind of stupid. Finally, JB feels that girls don't like Andrew.

In summarizing the group's view of Andrew's and Sharon's relationship, JG made the following points: First, Andrew wants freckles so that his mother won't know if his neck is dirty and he won't have to wash before school. Second, if he gets freckles, he will stop daydreaming about them, which is what is keeping him from paying attention in school. Third, when he doesn't pay attention, he can't find his place in his book. Fourth, when he gets in trouble, the other kids laugh. Fifth, JB doesn't feel that Sharon's giggling means that she dislikes Andrew, but JG, SC, and KH think that it does. Sixth, CZ is convinced that Andrew and Sharon are enemies. Seventh, Andrew knows that Sharon likes to make fun of him. Eighth, Sharon thinks she can get away with it. Finally, JB says that Sharon will get in trouble with the teacher.

To conclude the reciprocal dialogue for RSA, the group leader predicted what would happen to the characters in the RSB:

JG: Well, Sharon gets next to him in line, and she slithers her tongue out of her teeth and she tells him about the recipe. Sharon is going to play a trick on Andrew and get him to buy the recipe. Andrew will fall for the trick and buy the recipe.

In all, the *Insight Into Language*/original text group discussion of SS1 consisted of 402 conversational turns. Within the 315 turns comprising the reading conference for RSA, RSB, and RSC, 14 inside view and character plans focus questions were posed and discussed, approximately 23 turns per question. There were 4 life-to-text references, 3 text support references, and 7 teachable moments. In focusing on character as an important aspect of the story's literary content, the students cited 7 elements of the Cooperative Interaction Plan, 21 concepts related to character goals and essential beliefs, and 81 inside view ideas.

Thus, the qualitative analysis highlighted some of the *Insight Into Literature*/original text instructional context's distinguishing features. Reading as a social, communicative act was emphasized in the following ways: First, the students were as important as the experienced reader in mediating the communication between writer and readers. Second, the conference encouraged the active participation of all members of the group without domination by the experienced reader. Third, multiple points of view were expressed. Fourth, group members shared their responses to the story. Fifth, group members worked cooperatively in interpreting the literary content of the story.

A critical dimension of the social context was the experienced reader's role as a member of the group in asking questions or offering responses. When necessary, however, she served as "super-facilitator" to mediate the writer/reader communication, organize or refocus the discussion, and help the leader, or as teacher to provide explicit instruction on concepts related to particular passages. In discussing RSA, for example, 7 "teachable moments" occurred during which the experienced reader helped the students extend their understanding of vocabulary or explore literary analysis concepts.

Reading as a cognitive act was emphasized as students began to attend to the process itself. The reading process was made visible in the straightforward statement of purpose and procedures, active participation by the students in the reciprocal dialogues in which experience was gained in using the comprehension-monitoring strategies, and the use of text examples and text-to-life or life-to-text commentary in support of one's interpretation of the story.

The focus on character as an important aspect of fiction asserted that in interpreting literary content, the reader gains an appreciation of literary quality. The literary content focus emphasized the re-creation of believable characters, interpretation rather than literal recall of main ideas, and an appreciation of the story's literary content.

Finally, the insight discussion of RSA helped the readers re-create the characters' inner lives, providing a framework in which to interpret the events of RSB and RSC. The interpretation of the Cooperative Interaction Plan in RSB, for example, required an understanding of Andrew's self-deception and internal conflict and Sharon's intent to play a trick, all of which found their roots in aspects of inside view and character plans which were revealed in RSA. Similarly, the interpretation of Andrew's and Sharon's exchange of money and the recipe in RSC required an understanding of pragmatic cooperation despite interpersonal conflict which arose from both RSA and RSB. In addition, the students' interpretations of Social Sequences 2 and 3 were also influenced by their views of character in all of the segments comprising Social Sequence 1.

In contrast to the *Insight Into Literature* reading conference, the traditional instruction/basal text reading conference was organized as a guided reading discussion. The purpose of the guided reading primarily was to check the students' comprehension of ideas developed in the story rather than to emphasize a particular view of the reading process or to interpret literary content.

In the basal version of the story, RSA introduces Andrew as a boy who wants freckles because he does not want to wash his neck before going to school. It also includes a reference to Andrew's daydreaming in school followed by the segment in which Andrew asks Nicky how to get freckles. It differs from the original text primarily in its deletion of the reading group episode and concomitant omission of the antagonist, the interpersonal conflict, and an explicit statement relating Andrew's interest in getting freckles to his school problems.

After introducing the story and describing the guided reading procedures as noted earlier, the experienced reader posed a question to which the students responded. In some cases, follow-up questions were offered that were not included in the teacher's manual. For the most part, however, discussion was based upon the questions in the manual. Four comprehension check questions in the manual refer to RSA: (1) What did Andrew want? (2) Why did Andrew want freckles? (3) Do you think Nicky Lane really had a million freckles? (4) Why did Andrew feel stupid when he asked Nicky how he got his freckles? These questions generated approximately 25 turns of conversation.

In response to questions 1 and 2, the following dialogue occurred.

ER: What did Andrew want? Why did Andrew want freckles? Ok, JM, why don't you start?

JM: He wanted freckles because he hated to wash his neck and his mom wouldn't know if his neck was dirty if he had freckles.

ER: Anybody else want to add anything to why he wanted freckles?

JS: He wanted freckles because his mother knew his neck was dirty. He wouldn't have to wash and be late for school.

ER: Anybody else have any ideas about why he wanted them?

AS: He wanted to be just like Nicky.

SW: He thought it was neat to have freckles all over his face.

JS: What a ding-a-ling. I have a few.

The eight turns of conversation in response to these questions represent the classic question/response pattern in guided reading. The experienced reader controlled the discussion because she was the one who asked the questions. Her contribution as leader consisted of posing the questions and rephrasing question 2 two times. She did not offer opinions nor did she encourage the students to extend their responses. The students answered the questions by recalling rather than by interpreting ideas stated directly in the text. One life-to-text commentary was offered in the last turn of the dialogue.

Sharon is not introduced in the basal version until RSB when "a girl named Sharon" initiates the Cooperative Interaction Plan by telling Andrew that she knows how to get freckles. RSB consists of Andrew's and Sharon's interaction in which Sharon offers the recipe and tries to persuade Andrew to buy it. Andrew considers the offer and finally decides that he will give Sharon fifty cents in exchange for the recipe.

The teacher's manual includes seven questions related to RSB: (1) What did Sharon tell Andrew? (2) What did Sharon say Andrew had to do if he wanted to get freckles? (3) How did Sharon try to convince Andrew that it worked? (4) Did Andrew believe her right away? (5) Why did Andrew change his mind and decide to buy it? (6) Do you think Andrew liked Sharon? (7) What did Andrew decide to do if the recipe didn't work? The questions generated 67 turns of conversation.

For the most part, the guided reading questions concern the actions of the Cooperative Interaction Plan rather than the underlying goals and essential beliefs of the characters or inside views of the characters and their relationship. In response to question 3, for example, the teacher's manual suggests that an acceptable answer is the literal recall of the text in which Sharon tries to convince Andrew that the recipe will work. In contrast, an interpretive discussion of this element of the Cooperative Interaction Plan might explore Sharon as a character who views Andrew as gullible and capable of being convinced, and whose plan to play a trick cannot be successful unless she is persuasive.

It was not until question 6, that is, the tenth question posed by the experienced reader during the conference thus far, that the students were asked to reflect upon their views of the characters and their relationship. However, because the students had not discussed interpersonal conflict as part of the plot in RSA, they were at a disadvantage in trying to weave an interpretation of inside view and character plans with Andrew's and Sharon's actions and dialogue during RSB.

ER: Do you think Andrew liked Sharon?

AS: Not anymore.

ER: Why? Why did you say that, AS?

AS: Because it made him turn green.

The student's response referred to Social Sequence 2 in which Andrew drinks freckle juice and gets ill. The student implied that Andrew did not like Sharon after he realized that she had played a trick on him. However, there was no indication that the student understood that Sharon's goal from the outset

was to trick Andrew nor did he offer any insight on Andrew's and Sharon's relationship based upon the story to this point. The experienced reader did not follow-up the student's response with additional probes nor did she seek the viewpoints of other members of the group.

One feature of the guided reading that appears to have distinguished the traditional instruction/basal text reading conference was the life-to-text commentary. There were seven life-to-text segments of commentary. They served the purpose of extending the guided reading responses and enlivening the discussion. It is also possible that the commentary helped to fill-in the content gaps in the basal text, thus facilitating the students' re-creations of the characters.

In RSC, for example, Andrew and Sharon exchange fifty cents for the freckle juice recipe. One of the guided reading questions for this segment asks the students whether Andrew should expect Sharon to show him the recipe before he gives her the money. A greater depth of response to this question occurred when the students drew upon their personal experiences to interpret the characters' actions.

> ER: Ok. Well, was it right for Andrew to expect Sharon to show him the recipe before paying for it? KC, what do you think?
>
> KC: No, because he got sick.
>
> MS: I think it was OK. It's like saying this is really a deal. Let's say, if you want to get these smokebombs and then get them and they're pieces of paper with like a drop of . . .
>
> JS: Like a piece of paper with a picture of a smoke bomb . . .
>
> MS: Well, it's a piece of paper with a little dot of gunpowder on it.
>
> ER: Right. SW?
>
> SW: You know, if he saw it first he would be able to make up his own mind. Like when you go to a restaurant, they can explain to you what the food is like before you order it. She shouldn't get the money because she didn't let him see the recipe first.

In all, the reading conference for the traditional instruction/basal text group's discussion of SS1 consisted of 212 conversational turns, 146 of which were related to RSA, RSB, and RSC. The guided reading for SS1 consisted of 16 comprehension check questions which were posed by the experienced reader. The average number of turns per question was 9. There were 3 text references, 7 life-to-text commentaries, and 0 teachable moments. In the course of the discussion of SS1, the students referred to 5 elements of the Cooperative Interaction Plan, 10 goals or essential beliefs, and 24 inside view concepts.

The guided reading conference emphasized recall of main ideas rather than interpretation of those ideas. Its social structure did not engender cooperative interpretation and its cognitive context failed to make the reading process visible or to emphasize comprehension-monitoring strategies in a systematic fashion.

Within the social structure, the experienced reader controlled the discussion of main ideas by asking or rephrasing questions to focus attention or to organize the flow of the conference. Because the experienced reader relied on the teacher's manual to know when acceptable answers were offered, she did not generally encourage multiple viewpoints. In addition, she rarely offered her opinions or views.

In answering the questions, the students usually responded to the experienced reader rather than to one another. There was little evidence of a cooperative spirit in re-creating the story although some extensive conversation among the students did occur when the group drew upon life experiences to interpret the text. Overall, however, there was relatively little depth of response because the experienced reader did not probe the students nor did she encourage the students to probe one another.

The interpretation of character as an aspect of the story's literary content was secondary to the recall of information about the characters that was stated explicitly in the text. Thus, there was little attempt to re-create the inner lives of the characters or to understand character actions with respect to plans or inside view. Students were not encouraged to draw insight from the text. This failure prevented the readers from fully appreciating the literary qualities of the story.

Storyretellings

The quantitative analysis of the transcripts revealed several significant differences in the storyretellings that may be related to the instructional contexts in which the students participated. The results are reported with caution because of the relatively small number of students who participated in the study. However, as Hardyck and Petrinovich (1975) note, "The analysis of variance can be used with small samples with no great loss of power to detect differences" (p. 130). While the number of subjects may have been too small to detect other significant differences in the data, it nevertheless was large enough to detect the differences described below.

Cooperative Interaction Plan. Seven action sequences comprising the Cooperative Interaction Plan were identified in the text analysis: Sharon initiates the offer and Andrew responds; Sharon attempts to persuade Andrew to buy the recipe; Andrew considers the offer and decides to accept it. Finally, Andrew and Sharon exchange the money and the recipe. Both versions of the text included similar presentations of the Cooperative Interaction Plan. The *Insight Into Literature* instructional method groups discussed the Cooperative Interaction Plan primarily in the cooperative storyretelling activity. The traditional instructional method groups discussed the plan primarily in 10 guided reading questions posed by the experienced reader and answered by the students.

In retelling Social Sequence 1 during the individual interview, the students were asked to recall rather than to interpret the main events of the Cooperative Interaction Plan. Because of the text similarities in the presentation of the Cooperative Interaction Plan, the focus of the instructional discussions on the interacting plan and the individual interview's emphasis on recall of the main events related to the plan, it was predicted that there would be no significant differences in the retellings of the Cooperative Interaction Plan with respect to either the instructional method or text quality independent variables.

The null hypothesis was rejected, however, because the results of the ANOVA for the Cooperative Interaction Plan indicated a significant main effect for instructional method, $F(2,30) = 4.590$, $p < .05$. Post hoc analyses revealed that students retold more actions of the Cooperative Interaction Plan after participation in the *Insight Into Literature* groups ($M = 5.0833$) than after participation in the no instruction groups ($M = 2.9167$), $p < .01$. Students who participated in the traditional instruction groups ($M = 4.667$) also retold significantly more events of the Cooperative Interaction Plan when contrasted with those who participated in the no instruction groups, $p < .05$. There was no statistically significant main effect for text type nor was there a significant interaction of instructional method and text type.

Inside view. The text analysis of the original version of *Freckle Juice* identified 49 inside view concepts, 20 of which were related to Andrew's view of himself, and 9 of which were related to Andrew's view of Sharon. In analyzing the text, these particular components of inside view were found to be the most salient, although inside view concepts related to Andrew's view of his mother and his teacher as well as Sharon's view of herself also were identified. The basal version of *Freckle Juice*, however, was found to have deleted many of the passages that help the reader build the inner lives of the characters. The *Insight Into Literature* instructional method emphasized the interpretation of inside view in the original text and attempted to "fill-in" the gaps in the basal text by encouraging the students to draw upon their life experiences in building the inner lives of the characters. The traditional instruction's guided reading consisted of 16 questions, 4 of which concerned the interpretation of inside view and character plans. When coupled with the original text, it was anticipated that the discussion related to the guided reading questions would be more comprehensive than that associated with the basal text.

During the individual interview, the students were asked to include within their retellings of each social sequence their views of the characters and their relationships. Because of the substantive differences in the texts' presentations of inside view as well as the instructional contexts' discussions of inside view, it was predicted that the instructional method/text type group assignment would influence significantly the students' interpretations of inside view.

This hypothesis was confirmed. The results of the ANOVA indicated that there was a significant main effect for instruction, $F(2,30) = 3.969$, $p < .05$. Post hoc analyses revealed that students re-created more extensive inside views of the characters and their relationships after participation in the *Insight Into Literature* groups ($M = 11.5833$) than after participation in the no instruction groups ($M = 4.7500$), $p < .01$.

The results of the ANOVA also indicated a significant main effect for text type, $F(1,30) = 8.540$, $p < .01$. Post hoc analyses indicated that the original text group ($M = 11.3333$) significantly outperformed the basal text group ($M = 5.5000$) in the re-creation of inside view. No significant interaction of instruction and text type was detected.

Character plans. The text analysis of the original story identified 5 goals and 10 essential beliefs underlying Andrew's actions and 3 goals and 4 essential beliefs underlying Sharon's actions. It should be noted, however, that the original story was presented strongly from Andrew's point of view, making it difficult even for the experienced reader to re-create Sharon's perspective. This problem was further compounded in the basal version, which deleted many of the passages that help the reader re-create Andrew's as well as Sharon's goals and essential beliefs. The *Insight Into Literature* instructional method encouraged the students to interpret the main events of the story with respect to each character's independent goals and essential beliefs and to consider each character's plan within the broader context of inside view. Students also were encouraged to rely upon life experiences in re-creating the independent plans of the characters. As noted earlier, the traditional instruction's guided reading included four questions that referred to inside view and character plans. As with inside view, it was anticipated that traditional instruction coupled with the original text would result in a more astute discussion of plans than would traditional instruction associated with the basal text.

During the individual interview, the students were asked to include within their retellings of each social sequence their re-creations of the characters' goals and essential beliefs. Because the texts and the instructional discussions differed considerably in their focus on character plans, it was predicted that the instructional method/text type group assignment would influence significantly the students' interpretations of goals and essential beliefs.

This hypothesis was confirmed, although the findings were not as straightforward as those reported for inside view. The results of the ANOVA indicated that there was a significant main effect for text, $F(1,30) = 8.432$, $p < .01$. Students who participated in groups that read the original text re-created significantly more concepts related to character goals and essential beliefs ($M = 5.2222$) than did students who read the basal text ($M = 2.8889$). No significant main effect for instruction was detected nor was there a significant interaction of instructional method and text type.

Discussion

The results of the quantitative analysis suggest that both instructional method and text quality influence the young reader's interpretation of inside view and character plans in fiction. Furthermore, the combination of original, unadapted texts and sociocognitive instructional methods that emphasize literary content shows promise as an alternative instructional context for reading during the elementary school years.

Cooperative Interaction Plan

That an instructional method is of general importance even in helping students re-create the main events of stories was evident in the analysis of the children's retellings of the Cooperative Interaction Plan.

Three transcript examples illustrate some of the differences in the retelling of the Cooperative Interaction Plan that appear to be related to the instructional method variable. These examples are representative of the average number of responses per instructional context group, unless otherwise indicated.

The first retelling was created by KL, a student in the no instruction/original text group.

> KL: . . . Sharon said that she had a secret formula for freckle juice. And it was twenty-five, fifty cents. And so she said that she would bring him the secret recipe for freckle juice if he brought in the fifty cents the next day. And he brought in the fifty cents and Sharon brought in the freckle juice the next day. He was kind of wondering if he should do it because it was worth a whole five weeks worth of allowance . . . [inside view and plans statement] . . . And then he went to school one day--the next day and he got the formula.

KL's retelling began with a reference to Sharon's offer, but omitted Andrew's initial response to the offer. KL then shifted to Andrew's consideration of the recipe's worth. KL did not discuss Sharon's role in the interaction as she attempted to persuade Andrew to buy the recipe or Andrew's decision to buy the recipe. Rather, he ended this part of the retelling by announcing that Andrew got the formula. Neither Sharon's role nor Andrew's role in the exchange was explored. In all, KL received three points for his retelling of Sharon's offer, Andrew's consideration of the offer, and Andrew's part in the exchange.

The second retelling was created by MB, a student in the traditional instruction/original text group.

> MB: . . . Sharon says, sort of whispers in Andrew's ear that she has a magic juice that will give you freckles. She said, "It will cost you fifty cents for the recipe." Andrew thought about it and said, "That's a lot of money. That's five weeks allowance." [inside view and character plans statements] . . . He decided to try it. He walks over to his piggy bank, pops out, and counts five dimes. He wraps it in tissue and stuffs it in his pocket. He walks down and when he gets to school, he whispers--Sharon's already sitting there pretending to read. He walks over and he says, "Did you bring it?" She says, "Bring what?" Andrew says, "Your secret recipe for freckles." "Yeah, I've got it right here," and she patted her pocket. After Andrew sat down, he threw the dimes across. Sharon stuck out her foot and pulled it towards her and picked it up. She counted the five dimes and threw the piece of paper over. It landed in the middle of the aisle. He bent over to pick it up and he fell over. He lost his balance and he fell down. Miss Kelly didn't notice and he fell out of his chair.

MB's retelling was considerably more detailed than that of KL. MB accurately described Sharon's offer, but failed to note Andrew's initial response. MB omitted Sharon's efforts to persuade Andrew to buy the recipe, but included Andrew's consideration of the offer as well as his decision to accept it. MB concluded this portion of the retelling with an extensive discussion of both Andrew's and Sharon's roles in the exchange of the money and the recipe. In all, MB received 5 points for his retelling of the Cooperative Interaction Plan.

The third retelling was created by JG, a student in the *Insight Into Literature*/original text group. Because the average retelling of this group did not differ substantially from that of the traditional instruction/original group, JG's retelling is an example of a superior recall of the main events comprising the Cooperative Interaction Plan.

> JG: . . . Then Sharon goes, "I know how to get them." And then Andrew goes, "Get what?" Sharon says, "Freckles! I heard you talking to Nicky Lane about them." Then Andrew goes, "What about them?" And she says, "It will cost you fifty cents." Then Andrew goes, "Well, you don't have any." And then he points on her nose. "I have six," Sharon says. When Andrew says, "Alot of good six will do," Sharon says, "Well, it just depends on how much you drink" . . . [inside view and character plans statements] And that night, Andrew had trouble sleeping because he was thinking about freckle juice. He was thinking if there was such a thing as

> freckle juice . . . [inside view and character plans statements] . . . He didn't like the idea of paying Sharon fifty cents. But then he thought, "How come I never got freckles?" . . . [inside view and character plans statements] . . . Then he thought a little harder and said, "I know why, my family never knew about it!" . . . [inside view and character plans statements] . . . He finally falls asleep and the next morning he decides to buy it so he turns the four on the top and the zero on the bottom and takes out five dimes . . . So he goes to school and asks Sharon if she has the recipe and she says, "Have what?" Then he goes, "The recipe," and she goes, "Oh yeah, I have it." And she patted her pocket that she has it. Then she says, "Do you have the fifty cents?" And Andrew says, "Yes!" And he pats his pocket. Then he shoots fifty cents . . . [inside view and character plans statements] . . . over and she counts five dimes. And she throws it up to him and it lands in the middle of the aisle. He falls while he's trying to pick it up . . . [inside view statements].

JG's retelling of the Cooperative Interaction Plan was quite comprehensive. She referred to all of the action sequences identified in the text analysis. Her discussion of Andrew's consideration of the offer and decision to accept it went beyond the question of the recipe's worth as Andrew contemplated whether freckle juice was really the answer to his problem. JG presented Sharon's efforts to persuade Andrew and concluded her retelling of this portion with an explicit recounting of the exchange. JG received 7 points for her retelling of the Cooperative Interaction Plan.

The retellings and quantitative findings associated with them affirm the importance of instruction generally in helping students become attentive to the central aspects of plot. Students who did not have an opportunity to discuss their recall of the events within an instructional context were less likely to recall the important actions of Social Sequence 1 than were those that did have this opportunity. A somewhat more perplexing finding, however, concerned the instructional effect's association with the original text, but not the basal text. Why this occurred is unclear because both texts included similar presentations of the Cooperative Interaction Plan, and both instructional methods devoted considerable time to this portion of Social Sequence 1. Nevertheless, the combination of the more detailed content of the original version coupled with the *Insight Into Literature* or the traditional instructional methods appears to have resulted in more extensive re-creations of the Cooperative Interaction Plan.

Inside View

The data suggest that both the instructional method and the text type are important in helping students interpret inside view. The following comparison illustrates some of the differences in the students' re-creations of Andrew and his relationship with Sharon, the components of inside view which were most salient. The comparison contrasts the most extensive interpretations of inside view created by the students who participated in the *Insight Into Literature*/original text group and in the traditional instruction/basal text group.

CC, a student in the *Insight Into Literature*/original text group, wove the following inside view concepts with his retelling of the main events of the Cooperative Interaction Plan in Social Sequence 1.

> CC: Andrew Marcus wanted freckles more than anything in the world. He'd do anything to get them. . . [introduces Nicky]. . . He was always thinking about freckles so he didn't pay attention in class. Once, everybody was at reading group, but he wasn't because he wasn't listening when his teacher called the group. Well, he goes over there and everyone starts laughing and giggling, especially Sharon who is a pain to him most of the time . . . She always makes fun of him. She doesn't like him too much, and he doesn't like her either. They're not really friends. He needed courage to find out how to get freckles, but when he finally got up the nerve to ask Nicky, he felt pretty stupid asking such a dumb question. . . [describes Sharon's offer] . . .He was kind of rude when she told him about freckle juice. He didn't believe Sharon for one minute. Why should he believe someone who was never nice to him? . . . [describes Andrew's consideration of the offer] . . .Andrew was kind of bored--thinking, "What am I going to do next?" But then he thought, "Now I guess I know why nobody else has freckles in my family. They just don't know about freckle juice." So he decided to do it.

> . . [describes decision] . . .What a dummy. Anyway, he thinks that he can get his money back if the recipe doesn't work. . . [describes interaction with mother] . . .Well, by the next morning, he was so excited about getting freckle juice that he ran out the door. . . [describes exchange] . . .Andrew doesn't want to give Sharon the money until he has a chance to look at the recipe. That's only fair, but in the end he gives her the money first. He was a nice guy! But Sharon kicked it over with her foot. It landed in the middle of the aisle. She meant to do it. She's mean. She's bad. She wants to get Andrew in trouble with the teacher. She did because look at where it lands. She just wanted to be a pain. He tries to get it and he trips over his chair and falls down. Everybody starts laughing, except his teacher and him. I guess everybody was saying, "Boy, isn't he a klutz?" But it wasn't his fault that he got in trouble. It was Sharon's fault.

In CC's extensive re-creation of Social Sequence 1, he intertwined inside view concepts with a retelling of the main events. In so doing, CC offered a picture of Andrew and Sharon which provided insight into the characters' actions. In CC's view, Andrew was a person who was at various times pragmatic, determined to get freckles, inattentive in school, bored, timid, rude, clear-headed in distrusting Sharon but dumb when he decides to go along with the offer, excitable, fair, and nice. Sometimes, Andrew felt stupid; sometimes he felt in control. CC received 14 points for his view of Andrew.

CC's view of Andrew's relationship with Sharon firmly established interpersonal conflict as an important aspect of the plot. CC received 10 points for his re-creation of Andrew's view of Sharon. CC noted that Sharon laughed at Andrew and made fun of him. Andrew thought Sharon was a pain and was not nice. Andrew didn't like Sharon very much. They weren't friends. Andrew distrusted Sharon. Indeed, CC felt that Sharon's purposeful act of throwing the recipe in the aisle indicated that she was a bad person, a mean person who was intent upon getting Andrew in trouble with the teacher. In CC's view, it was Sharon's fault that Andrew got in trouble.

In contrast, a student in the traditional instruction/basal text group, JS, created the following inside view interpretation as she retold Social Sequence 1.

> JS: Andrew Marcus wanted freckles. . . [describes Nicky's freckles] . . .Andrew is kind of jealous cause he wants freckles just like Nicky. . . [teacher asks Andrew if he's paying attention; conversation with Nicky] . . .After Nicky walked away, Sharon, who is the big snob in the class and kind of a cheapskate walked up and said, "I know how to get them. . . [describes offer, response, persuasion, consideration] . . .Well, at first he didn't really believe her, which was good. He was kind of shocked because he had never heard of freckle juice. But when he was walking home, he thought, did he want freckles or not, did he want freckles or not?. . . [describes decision and exchange] . . .Everyone started giggling.

JS retold Social Sequence 1 admirably, including all of the cooperative interaction main events which were identified in the text analysis. She provided some insight into the actions and dialogue as she attempted to build an inside view of Andrew and his relationship with Sharon. However, this view was far less developed than that offered by CC. In JS's view, Andrew was a person who was sometimes jealous of Nicky and inattentive in school. She indicated that Andrew was astute in disbelieving Sharon and in being shocked about the idea of freckle juice. Andrew was thoughtful in considering whether or not he wanted freckles. JS received 5 points for her view of Andrew's thoughts and feelings.

JS also tried to re-create a relationship between Andrew and Sharon, and although she was not as successful in the re-creation as was CC, there was evidence that she perceived interpersonal conflict as an important feature of the interaction. JS received 4 points for her re-creation of the relationship: Andrew viewed Sharon as a snob and a cheapskate who, along with the rest of the class, liked to laugh at him. For these reasons, Andrew distrusted Sharon.

The transcripts and quantitative findings related to inside view suggest that an instructional context that combines an original text and an instructional method that emphasizes literary form and content facilitates the young reader's ability to weave an interpretation of content with the recall of events. In

this research, the students who participated in the *Insight Into Literature*/original text group consistently produced more insightful retellings than did the students who participated in all but one of the other context conditions. The exception to this finding concerned the contrast of the *Insight Into Literature*/original text group and the traditional instruction/original text group which was not significant. For students who participated in the latter group, access to the original text appears to have resulted in more extensive interpretations of inside view than were created by students in the no instruction/basal group. However, this finding is interpreted extremely cautiously because the traditional instruction/original text group's interpretations of inside view did not differ significantly from those created by the students who participated in all of the other conditions.

Character Plans

Although the results were less consistent for character plans than they were for inside view, they suggest that text type was an important variable in distinguishing the students' interpretations of character plans. In addition, there was some evidence that the combination of the original text and the *Insight Into Literature* instructional method resulted in more insightful interpretations of character goals and essential beliefs as students retold main events.

The following contrast of transcript excerpts illustrates some of the differences in the interpretation of character plans that may be related to participation in the alternative instructional contexts. The first example is that of the most extensive interpretation of Andrew's plan offered by students who participated in the traditional instruction/basal text group.

> AF: Well, at first, there is a boy named Andrew Marcus and he wants freckles. He wants freckles really bad because there's this person who has a lot of freckles and he thinks that if he gets freckles, he don't have to wash himself and then he won't be late for school. So, one day, he goes to school. . . [conversation with Nicky, inside view statements, Sharon's offer, Andrew's response, Sharon's attempt to persuade, Andrew's consideration of the offer]. . . Then he says, "Should I pay fifty cents to get a freckle juice formula? I don't know if its worth it. But he decides to get it and do it. . . [describes exchange, inside view statements].

AF established the underlying motivation for Andrew's actions in Social Sequence 1 when he asserted that Andrew wanted freckles and explicitly linked this essential belief to a statement describing one of the problems that Andrew felt he had. Beyond this, however, AF drew little insight to help him interpret the actions of the Cooperative Interaction Plan. The one exception was his reference to Andrew's internal conflict in which he debated internally whether freckle juice existed. AF, however, referred only to Andrew's consideration of the recipe's worth rather than its very existence. He then concluded this portion of the retelling by noting that Andrew decided to buy the recipe, but he failed to interpret the decision with respect to character plans. AF made no reference to Sharon's goals or essential beliefs nor did he refer to interpersonal conflict and pragmatic cooperation. In all, AF received 3 points for citing the essential belief that Andrew wanted freckles, the linking of that belief to the washing/late for school problem, and the internal conflict as to whether the recipe was worth 50. AF, however, failed to re-create a plan for Sharon.

In contrast, the following retelling of Social Sequence 1, which included an interpretation of Andrew's and Sharon's plans, was offered by a student in the *Insight Into Literature*/original text group.

> JG: Andrew wanted to get freckles and Nicky Lane had a ton of them. Andrew thought he had millions and trillions of freckles. Andrew wanted freckles because then he wouldn't be late for school because his ma wouldn't know if his neck was dirty or not. So, and also, he counts Nicky Lane's freckles in school and he gets in trouble because usually, the teacher will call on him and say, "Are you paying attention?" And Andrew will say, "Yes," even though he's not paying attention. Or they will be in a reading group and people will laugh at him, especially Sharon, cause he's not paying attention. . . [describes reading group] . . .and Sharon kept giggling. Sharon is never very nice to him. He thinks she's a know-it-all. He thinks if he had freckles, things like that wouldn't happen. Finally, the day was over and Miss Kelly

said that Andrew was to lead the boys in line and Sharon could lead the girls. Andrew was like, oh no, I get to stand next to Sharon!. . . [describes conversation with Nicky, Sharon's offer and attempt to persuade, Andrew's response and consideration of the offer] . . .Sharon's trying to talk him into buying the recipe, but he doesn't believe her. She tries to convince him to do it, but he isn't sure. Sharon is very tricky. She's a brat and a practical joker. She likes joking people. She's trying to trick him because she thinks she can play a joke on him, she thinks she can make fun of him. She hates him. I bet she just wasn't likable. If I knew a girl like Sharon, I'd really get her. I'd go in the girls room with soda pop and a bucket and tie it to the door and when she opens it, I'd say, "There's a present in the bathroom for you. And when she opens it, CRASH! Anyway, then Sharon bites her tongue along her teeth and it reminds Andrew of a frog catching a fly. He thinks that's yucky and weird. He doesn't like it when she does that. And that night Andrew had trouble sleeping because he was thinking about freckle juice. He didn't like the idea of paying Sharon fifty cents. She wasn't even his friend. He really didn't believe that there was such a thing as freckle juice. If there was such a thing, would it work? But he really wanted freckles, so he didn't know what to do. Then he thought, "How come I never got freckles?" Then, he thought a little harder and said, "I know why, my family never knew about it!" So, he talked himself into thinking that he could get freckles if he drank freckle juice. He finally falls asleep and the next morning, he decides to buy it. He buys it from Sharon even though he doesn't like her, even though she's not his friend. . . [describes decision, conversation with mother, exchange].

JG's retelling of Social Sequence 1 conveys the possibilities for the interpretation of literary content by Grade 3 students. JG not only imbued her retelling of the main events with an interpretation of inside view and character plans, but she also offered a life-to-text commentary on a way in which students often react to people like Sharon. In her weaving of interpretation and retelling of events, she revealed considerable insight into the characters' actions. In interpreting Andrew's plan, JG established a context for the Cooperative Interaction Plan by referring to Andrew's goal of getting freckles and his essential belief of wanting freckles. She specifically linked Andrew's goal to the washing/late for school problem and the inattentiveness/peer laughter problem. She described the dimensions of the internal conflict, and she referred to the notion of self-deception. Finally, she described Andrew's and Sharon's interpersonal conflict and adversarial relationship and showed evidence of understanding the concept of pragmatic cooperation. In all, JG received 3 points for her interpretation of Andrew's goals: getting freckles, self-deception, and pragmatic cooperation. She received 8 points for her interpretation of Andrew's essential beliefs: wanting freckles, two problems, internal conflict with the dimensions of clear-headedness versus gullibility, and interpersonal conflict with the dimension of the adversarial relationship.

In addition, JG also re-created a perspective for Sharon. She received 2 points for recognizing that Sharon's goal was to make a fool of Andrew by playing a trick on him. She also received 3 points for recognizing the following essential beliefs: Sharon knew that freckle juice did not exist, and that Sharon and Andrew were involved in an interpersonal conflict which was apparent in their adversarial relationship. She did not view Sharon's behavior as pragmatic nor did she indicate that Sharon had to convince Andrew of her sincerity and friendship in order for Andrew to agree to buy the recipe.

Thus, in interpreting the characters' independent plans, JG demonstrated an understanding that the actions and dialogue of the Cooperative Interaction Plan did not necessarily reveal the characters' true intentions. The motivation for the story's events became apparent when she re-created inside view and character plans. It was, thus, an understanding of inside view and character plans which enabled JG to interpret the events and, in so doing, to appreciate the literary content of the story.

Implications for Research and Teaching

The research suggests that young readers are capable of weaving an interpretation of literary form and content and a spontaneous storyretelling. Whether students will be successful in extending their re-creations of stories through interpretation, however, may depend upon their participation in instructional contexts that emphasize literary features.

It is of interest to investigate further two aspects of the study. First, during the individual interviews, the Grade 3 students were able to retell the main events of the story without direct question probes, provided that they had participated in instructional contexts that emphasized these events. In this research, the *Insight Into Literature* instructional method included cooperative storyretelling to provide a social context for the re-creation of the story's main events. The traditional instructional method utilized direct question probes to expose the main events. Both of these instructional approaches resulted in effective retellings of the main events, and both were more effective than no instruction in this regard.

This finding appears to be in contradiction to comments by, for example, Brown and Campione (cited in Shannon, Kameenui, & Baumann, 1988) that elementary students are poor storyretellers. Shannon et al. refer to Brown and Campione's statement in support of their finding that sixth-grade students are not superior to second-grade students in their ability to integrate references to character motives within their retellings of fables. In contrast, both sixth-grade students and fourth-grade students significantly outperformed second-grade students in attributing motives to characters in fables when presented with direct question probes. The resolution of this contradiction will require further exploration of elementary school-age children's storyretelling abilities.

Beyond the question of storyretelling abilities, the current research raises a more important question, which is related to Shannon et al.'s findings. In the current research, Grade 3 children were found to be capable of the spontaneous interpretation of story events without direct question probes. In this study, the students who participated in the *Insight Into Literature*/original text instructional context were able to re-create inside view and character plans and to interpret story events with respect to their understanding of the characters. This finding appears to be in contradiction to Stein and Glenn's observation that "retellings rarely elicit sophisticated internal response statements" (cited in Shannon et al., p. 454) as well as to Shannon et al.'s conclusion that even sixth-grade students demonstrate relatively poor comprehension of character motives in fables in the course of spontaneous storyretellings.

A second issue that merits further investigation/concerns the abilities of elementary school-age children to interpret literary content without direct question probes. Two explanations may account for the contradiction. First, the current research examined the young reader's interpretation of realistic fiction. This genre may be more accessible to elementary school-age children than the fable. Second, unlike the students in the Shannon et al. study who did not participate in instruction prior to the interviews, some of the students in the current research did participate in instructional interventions. Although the interventions were limited in scope, the findings of the research indicate that the instructional context variables of instructional method and text type are critical to the students' success in intertwining storyretelling and the interpretation of literary content. The students who participated in the *Insight Into Literature*/original text group were novice interpreters, but they demonstrated that with the benefit of an original, unadapted, relatively high-quality text and an instructional method which emphasized the text's important literary features, they were capable of creating an enriched view of the story. It is of both theoretical and practical interest, therefore, to continue to develop *Insight Into Literature* as an alternative instructional context for reading.

The next phase of this research will expand the *Insight Into Literature* core instructional components to create an integrated reading, writing, and discussion context. The instructional context will continue to emphasize the interpretation of literary form and content within a sociocognitive model of the reading process. To gain a broader perspective on literary form and content and to provide a common ground for discussion and writing, however, students will integrate the reading of fiction with the reading of relevant historical, cultural, artistic, scientific, biographical, philosophical, and psychological texts. The goal of this integration, thus, is to help children acquire naturally an appreciation of literary quality along with the acquisition of literacy.

References

Atwell, N. (1984). Writing and reading from the inside out. *Language Arts, 61*(3), 240-252.

Bennett, W. J. (1988, September). James Madison Elementary School: A curriculum for American students. *Education Week*, 24, 39.

Blume, J. (1971). *Freckle Juice*. New York: Four Winds Press. Also appears in adapted from in I. E. Aaron & R. Koke (Eds.) (1985). *Hidden Wonders* (pp. 317-334). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Bruce, B. C. (1978). What makes a good story? *Language Arts, 55*, 460-466.

Bruce, B. C. (1980). Plans and social actions. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension* (pp. 367-384). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bruce, B. C. (1984). A new point of view on children's stories. In R. C. Anderson, J. Osborn, & R. J. Tierney (Eds.), *Learning to read in American schools: Basal readers and content texts* (pp. 153-174). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bruce, B. C. (1985). Stories in readers and tradebooks. In J. Osborn, P. T. Wilson, & R. C. Anderson (Eds.), *Reading education: Foundations for a literate America* (pp. 29-45). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Bruce, B. C., & Newman, D. (1978). Interacting plans. *Cognitive Science, 2*, 195-233.

Boynton, R. W., & Maynard, M. (1985). *Introduction to the short story* (3rd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cheney, L. V. (1987). *American memory: A report on the humanities in the nation's public schools*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Clear Lake Research (1986). *CLR ANOVA*. Houston, TX: Clear Lake Research.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1984). *The making of a reader*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1987). *Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the craft of reading, writing, and mathematics* (Tech. Rep. No. 403). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Cullinan, B. E. (Ed.) (1987). *Children's literature in the reading program*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goodman, K. (1986). *What's whole in whole language?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodman, K. S., Freeman, Y., Murphy, S., & Shannon, P. (1987). *Report card on the basals*. Draft report presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English, Los Angeles, CA.

Graves, D., & Hansen, J. (1983). The author's chair. *Language Arts, 60*(2), 176-183.

Hains, M. (Ed.) (1982). *A two-way street--Reading to write--Writing to read*. Rochester, MI: Michigan Council of Teachers of English.

Hall, D. (1987). *To read fiction*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Hancock, J., & Hills, S. (1987). *Literature-based reading programs at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hansbury, P. G. (1988). From response to interpretation. In B. F. Nelms (Ed.), *Literature in the classroom* (pp. 105-120). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hansen, J. (1987). *When writers read*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hardyck, C., & Petrinovich, L. (1975). *Understanding research in the social sciences*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.

Heath Reading (1989). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Hersey, J. (1981). *The writer's craft*. New York: Knopf.

Hepler, S. I., & Hickman, J. (1982). The book was okay. I love you. Social aspects of response to literature. *Theory Into Practice, 21*(4), 278-283.

Hornsby, D., Sukarna, D., & Parry, J. (1986). *Read on: A conference approach to reading*. Porstmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Johnson, T. D., & Louis, D. R. (1987). *Literacy through literature*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Jose, P. E. (1988). Linking of plan-based stories: The role of goal importance and goal attainment difficulty. *Discourse Processes, 11*(3), 261-273.

Kahn, E. A., Walter, C. C., & Johannessen, L. R. (1984). *Writing about literature*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Kundera, M. (1984). *The unbearable lightness of being*. New York: Harper & Row.

Lamme, L. L. (Ed.) (1981). *Learning to love literature*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Langer, J. A. (1986). *Children reading and writing*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Liebling, C. R. (1989a). From the outside looking in: Inside view and character plans in an original story and its basal reader adaptation. *Theory Into Practice, 28*(2), 88-97.

Liebling, C. R. (1989b). *Children's comprehension of inside view and character plans in fiction: A pilot investigation* (Tech. Rep. No. 459). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Literary Readers (1989). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Moss, J. F. (1984). *Focus units in literature: A handbook for elementary school teachers*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Nelms, B. F. (1988). Sawing the dragon's teeth: An introduction in the first person. In B. F. Nelms (Ed.), *Literature in the classroom* (pp. 1-16). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Newman, D., & Bruce, B. C. (1986). Interpretation and manipulation in human plans. *Discourse Processes, 9*(2), 167-195.

Ohanian, S. (1987). Ruffles and flourishes. *The Atlantic Monthly, 260*(3), 20-22.

Ohanian, S. (1988, October). How to create a generation of 'aliterates.' *Education Week*, pp. 32, 26.

Palinscar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1*, 117-175.

Parker, E. A. (1969). *Teaching the reading of fiction*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pickering, J. H., & Hoeper, J. D. (1982). *Literature*. New York: Macmillan.

Ravitch, D. (1987). Where have all the classics gone? You won't find them in primers. *New York Times Book Review*.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1982). The literary transaction: Evocation and response. *Theory Into Practice, 21*(4), 268-277.

Rothman, R. (1988, September). California panel urges state board to pick reading textbooks with 'real literature.' *Education Week*, pp. 1, 12.

Shannon, P., Kameenui, E. J., & Baumann, J. F. (1988). An investigation of children's ability to comprehend character motives. *American Educational Research Journal, 25*(3), 441-462.

Somers, A. B., & Worthington, J. E. (1979). *Response guides for teaching children's books*. Urbana, IL: National Council for Teachers of English.

Stein, N., & Glenn, C. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R. Freedle (Ed.), *New directions in discourse processes, 2* (pp. 53-120). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Steinberg, C. (1981). *The role of beliefs and character interaction in the analysis and comprehension of children's stories.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English, Boston, MA.

Steinberg, C., & Bruce, B. C. (1980). Higher level features in children's stories: Rhetorical structure and conflict. In M. L. Kamil & A. J. Moe (Eds.), *Perspectives on reading research and instruction* (pp. 117-125). Washington, DC: National Reading Conference.

Troy, A., & Green, P. (1987). *Novel units: Freckle Juice*. Palatine, IL: Novel Units.

Watson, D. J., & Davis, S. C. (1988). Readers and texts in a fifth grade classroom. In B. F. Nelms (Ed.), *Literature in the classroom* (pp. 59-67). Urbana, IL: National Council for Teachers of English.

Author Note

I would like to thank the following people: The staff and students of Hollis Elementary School, Hollis, NH for their willingness to participate in the research; Laurie Goodman and Jane Pence for their research assistance; Chip Bruce for his thoughtful comments on the research; and Vicki Morse and Sue Stelmack for their assistance in preparing the manuscript.